

Author	Comments	Response
<p>Rob Hutsel San Diego River Park Foundation Verbal comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Three projects missing: Kumeyaay Lakes Dredging and Berm Restoration, Old Mission Dam Dredging, Presidio Park Hill Stabilization 2. On page 3, would like to see language including history and culture 3. On page 4, found language “committed to working independently” troubling and would like to see it stricken from plan 4. On page 5, would like to see “success” as an additional criterion added under project criteria 5. On page 17, commented that trail should go from Pacific Ocean to Trans County Trail, not to Headwaters. Feels those lands are already publicly available and very “pristine”. 6. Suggested mentioning the San Diego River Park Foundation and San Diego River Coalition in the Executive Summary. 7. Recommended interim Mission Statement refer back to Article 2 of enabling legislation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These projects have been added in Program 3 (pages 37-38). 2. Language has been added throughout the document to reference the importance of cultural and historic resources. 3. Reference removed. 4. Reference added (page 6). 5. Commented noted. The Conservancy has not established this as a policy. It will be scheduled as a topic of a future Board meeting. 6. More references to partners were added throughout the document and a list of key partners added in Appendix 2. 7. Changes were made to the Mission Statement to reflect the discussion at the meeting of February 10, 2006 (page 4).
<p>Mark Weston Helix Water District Verbal comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helix Water represents and owns a lot of land east of Highway 67. Interest in the Conservancy is as a partner and wants document to be clear on the following points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project 1.2 El Monte Valley 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. See revisions to Project 1.2 (page 11). 1b. Addition made (page 18). 1c. Addition made (page 19). 1d. Addition made (page 24). 1e. Change made (page 32).

Author	Comments	Response
	<p>Property 500 acres owned by Helix Water – does not want the Plan to suggest that Helix Water Board has taken any action</p> <p>b. Project 1.3 Cedar Creek Falls to City of San Diego – trail will have to cross Helix property and they want to be acknowledged as partner</p> <p>c. Project 1.5 Historic Flume Trail – as above would like to be acknowledged as a partner.</p> <p>d. Page 25 El Monte Park Amenities – Helix is a key partner and should be identified in the text.</p> <p>e. Page 32 Project 1.1 refers to El Monte Dam, but should be referenced as El Capitan Dam</p>	
<p>Deborah Jones Lakeside's River Park Conservancy Verbal and written comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urged adoption of the resolution to accept the Plan and move forward 2. Presented SDRC Plan to Lakeside's RPC Governing Board on Feb. 27th, 2006 which took an action to formally support the SDRC Plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment acknowledged. 2. Comment acknowledged.
<p>Karen Scarborough Board Member California Resources Agency Verbal comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commended staff and consultant 2. Expressed uncertainty about 60 day review period – wants to see it done sooner 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment acknowledged. 2. Board will conduct a special meeting in March 2006 to consider adoption of final Plan.

Author	Comments	Response
Jim Bartell Board Member Verbal comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commended staff and consultant 2. Expressed concern about review period being too long and stressed the importance of getting a final Plan adopted and to the State in March to send a strong message to the Resource Agency 3. Page 8 referenced 3 jurisdictions with land use authority, but there are also 5 tribal nations that should be included since they have sovereignty within their boundaries 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment acknowledged. 2. Board will conduct a special meeting in March 2006 to consider adoption of final Plan. 3. Reference was made to the tribes represented in the watershed in the Assumptions section (page 5).
Donna Frye Board Chair San Diego City Council Verbal comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed a desire to move quickly, but wanted to be sure the public would have enough time to comment 2. Along with board members present, moved to amend mission statement to read "The mission of the San Diego River Conservancy is to further the goals of its enabling legislation (land conservation, recreation and education, habitat preservation and restoration, water quality and natural flood conveyance, and historical cultural) by conserving and restoring its land and water for the enjoyment of present and future generations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment acknowledged. 2. Mission statement revised to reflect comments from the Board and public at the meeting of February 10, 2006 (page 4).
John Minan Board Vice Chair SD Regional Water Quality Control Board Verbal comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moved to amend the mission statement 2. Generally felt there should be statement of why projects were included (why they are significant or 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission statement revised to reflect comments from the Board and public at the meeting of February 10, 2006 (page 4). 2. Not all projects in all reaches were

Author	Comments	Response
	<p>important)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Removal of invasive species is important but projects should also be designed to prevent reemergence (i.e. a management component is needed) 4. Reference to Assembly Bill should be changed to cite Public Resource Code 	<p>included. Staff worked closely with Partners to select the highest priority projects most likely to be accomplished within the five year planning period. Priority was based on the project criteria described in the introductory section.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Comment noted and reference included in Program 3 (page 30). 4. The Public Resource Code reference was included but the Assembly Bill reference was retained as many members of the public still cite the Assembly Bill reference when describing the San Diego River Conservancy Act. It is also desirable to recognize Senator Kehoe's vital role in creating the Conservancy.
<p>Susan Hector Board member Verbal comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concern at the lack of mention of cultural and historic resource significance. Specific written recommendations were subsequently submitted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additions made throughout the document to reflect the importance of cultural and historic resources pursuant to Dr. Hector's recommendations. In addition, a new section of cultural preservation projects was added in Program 3.
<p>Jim Peugh Board member Verbal comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wanted to see length of review period shortened 2. Would like to see partners and relationships amongst partners mentioned in the Plan 3. Would like to see more emphasis on 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Additional references to partners were added throughout the document. A list of key partners was added in Appendix 2. 3. The recommendations from the

Author	Comments	Response
	<p>water quality measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Would like to see “project maintainability” and “sustainability” added to list of project criteria 5. Page 27 – would like to see language removed about density and height of vegetation being one of the most important safety issues 	<p>Hydrology Assessment of the San Diego River Watershed will be used to define future projects to improve water quality and hydrology in the San Diego River. (page 41).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Additions made (page 6). 5. The language and photo have been revised (page 26).
<p>Jim Madaffer San Diego City Council Written comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would like to see two projects included in the Plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Kumeyaay Lakes Dredging and Berm Restoration b. Old Mission Dam Dredging Project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These projects have been added in Program 3 (page 37).
<p>Dorothy Leonard Mission Trails Regional Park Citizen’s Advisory Committee Written comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would like to see two projects included in the Plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Kumeyaay Lakes Dredging and Berm Restoration b. Old Mission Dam Dredging Project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These projects have been added in Program 3 (page 37).
<p>Joshua Garcia, Paul Kilberg and Rick Thompson, City of San Diego, E-mail communication</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General comment; trail info is vague, seems like it loses specifics once west of Santee. 2. Are the four goals of the Conservancy, listed on page 3, in order of importance? 3. Program 1 (page 9); what would happen to any land the Conservancy owned and managed after 2011? 4. Project 1.8 (page 21); the southern stretch of the golf course is on land leased from the City of San Diego. In 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The purpose of the Strategic and Infrastructure Plan is to provide broad goals consistent with the Conservancy’s Statutory Authority which would later be refined in greater detail. The information presented is generally based on preliminary analyses (including analyses in existing River Planning documents); additional details will be presented as projects are refined. 2. No.

Author	Comments	Response
	<p>addition, this area is in critical habitat for the Least Bells Vireo and there are various existing and potential mitigation sites along the river from which recreation could be precluded as part of permit conditions for wetland mitigation from the various wildlife agencies.</p> <p>5. Project 1.9 (page 21); no information is provided on locations within the City of San Diego reaches for the construction of 3.5 miles of trails. Actual distance from eastern boundary of City of San Diego to ocean is approximately 15, what is the status of the remaining 11.5 miles of trail? How much trail exists on the San Diego River within the City of San Diego? With all the private ownerships, would any trail be proposed on private land? Please provide more information, even if it is conceptual.</p> <p>6. Project 3 (page 28); bike lockers are good ideas to facilitate patrols but lockers near the river could be subject to various forms of vandalism. Additionally, who would be responsible for maintenance?</p> <p>7. Program 3 (page 31); are these 900 acres of restoration currently identified</p>	<p>3. If the Conservancy were to sunset, any owned land would be transitioned to a responsible entity prior to the sunset.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. The River contains important habitat for many species. The Conservancy will balance the goals established in its statute to provide recreation, education and access while protecting the resource.</p> <p>5. See 1.above. The revised maps to be included with the March 24, 2006 version of the Plan will show currently existing trail miles within the City of San Diego and the entire San Diego River Watershed. A proposed trail is also provided in the City of San Diego's Draft San Diego River Park Masterplan. No further information is currently available.</p> <p>6. This project would be developed with the public safety agencies along the River. Maintenance will be addressed at that time.</p> <p>7. No, see 1, above.</p>

Author	Comments	Response
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project, written comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged that SDRC and SCWRP share mutual goals and should collaborate in order to implement their strategic plans. 2. Suggested that the SCWRP Regional Strategy is referenced as a planning document in the Plan. 3. Would like to see more detail given to the 5 habitat restoration projects identified in Program 3 of the Plan – specifically to include goals of each project and type of restoration proposed, as well as addressing project phasing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concur. Many of the projects identified in the Conservancy's Strategic and Infrastructure Plan share the objectives and priorities of the WRP Regional Strategy. The Conservancy did submit early concept proposals for the WRP Work plan Update during the last round. 2. The reference was added (page 49). 3. The purpose of the Strategic and Infrastructure Plan is to provide broad goals consistent with the Conservancy's Statutory Authority which would later be refined in greater detail. The information presented is generally based on preliminary analyses (including analyses included in River Planning documents); additional details will be presented as projects are refined.
Mission Valley Community Council, Written comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council took formal action on March 15, 2006 to fully support SDRC's Plan and urge the Conservancy's Governing Board to approve it. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments acknowledged.
Gary Strawn, Written comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would like to see mention of fish and fishing in the Plan – specifically with regard to education and recreation. 2. Suggested including photos of people fishing in future presentations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A reference to fishing was included in the section on education (page 14). 2. Staff is currently seeking appropriate pictures for possible future use.

Author	Comments	Response
<p>Trish Boaz, Kathleen Flannery, Joe DeStefano, Jon VanRhyn, Brian Albright, Vince Nicoletti, County of San Diego, e-mail communication</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="716 240 1314 1031">1. Page 39: Please delete the following language: “For example, the Conservancy is currently working with the SDRPF and a family trust to facilitate what should be a simple donation to the SDRPF. Unfortunately, the trust found that the donation would require compliance with the Subdivision Map Act, which would require substantial fee payments to San Diego County.” It is inappropriate to include this language as it may be inaccurate and not knowing the details of this specific project, it is best to assume it is inaccurate given that the County of San Diego does have an Environmental Subdivision Ordinance (Regulatory Ordinance Section 81.1400) which in addition, waives fees for non-profit organizations.<li data-bbox="716 1031 1314 1284">2. The County does not believe adequate attention has been given to the cultural and historical resources of the San Diego River Watershed. Please consider beefing up the discussion of cultural and historical resources in this document.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1383 240 1976 381">1. It is included as an example of something that did happen and the Conservancy Board has discussed on the record in much detail.<li data-bbox="1383 381 1976 522">2. Noted. Changes have been made throughout the document to reference the protection of cultural and historic resources.